

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

SK



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/684,023 | 10/06/2000 | Joseph B. Rowlands | 5580-00300 | 2300 |
| 34399 | 7590 | 08/13/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON LLP | | | HUYNH, KIM T | |
| P.O. BOX 160727 | | | ART UNIT | |
| AUSTIN, TX 78716-0727 | | | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2112 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/684,023 | Applicant(s) ROWLANDS ET AL.  | |
| | Examiner Kim T. Huynh | Art Unit 2112 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 20-29, 32-45 and 47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 20-29, 32-45 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt Acknowledgement

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the request filed on 6/01/04 for a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on the application No. 09/684023, which the request is acceptable and an RCE has been established. Currently, claims 1-18, 20-29, 32-45 and 47 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18, 20-29, 32-45, 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (US Patent 6,467,002) in view of Smith (US Patent 6,571,306)

As per claims 1,9,24, Yang discloses a first agent configured for coupling to a bus in which said first agent is one of a plurality of agents that are capable of being coupled to said bus, said plurality of agents having corresponding arbiters coupled to receive request signals and operate as distributed arbiters among the plurality of agents, said request signals corresponding to whether or not the arbiter of a respective agent is arbitrating for said bus and (col.4, lines 26-63), (col.5, lines 1-37)

Yang discloses all the limitations as above except wherein an arbiter of said first agent is to maintain order of its priority in relation to other agents arbitrating for said bus and to determine if said first agent wins an arbitration for said bus responsive to said request signals without determining which other agent wins arbitration, if said first agent does not win arbitration. However, Smith discloses distributed arbitration, each bus master sees all bus requests and determines whether or not it has priority to take control of the bus. A particular bus master having a default bus grant, it need not request access to the bus. The parked bus master initiate transactions without first arbitrating for bus access by issuing a bus request. (col.1, lines 48-67), (col.3, line 64-col.5, line 30)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Smith's teaching into Yang system so as to improve a better performance for the system. (col.2, lines 9-17)

As per claim 17, Yang discloses a method comprising:

- Maintaining in a distributed arbiter for a first agent, a state indicative of: (i) which of a plurality of agents coupled to a bus are higher priority than said first agent for an arbitration, and (col.5, lines 15-37) (ii) which of said plurality of agents are lower priority than said first agent for said arbitration; (col.7, lines 31-44)
- Arbitrating for the bus by sending a request signal;(col.6, lines 19-65)
- Receiving request signals of other agents arbitrating for the bus; and (col.5, lines 1-37)

Yang discloses all the limitations as above except determining the state of the first agent in relation to priorities of other agents arbitrating for the bus to determine if the first agent wins said arbitration, but without determining which other agent wins arbitration, if said first agent does not win arbitration. However, Smith discloses distributed arbitration, each bus master sees all bus requests and determines whether or not it has priority to take control of the bus. A particular bus master having a default bus grant, it need not request access to the bus. The parked bus master initiate transactions without first arbitrating for bus access by issuing a bus request. (col.1, lines 48-67), (col.3, line 64-col.5, line 30)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Smith's teaching into Yang system so as to improve a better performance for the system. (col.2, lines 9-17)

As per claims 2, 10, Yang discloses wherein said arbiter of said first agent comprises one or more registers configured to store a state indicative of:

- which of said plurality of agents are higher priority than said first agent are higher priority than said first agent for said arbitration; (col.5, lines 15-37)
- which of said plurality of agents are lower priority than said first agent for said arbitration. (col.7, lines 31-44)

As per claims 3, 11 Yang discloses arbiter of said first agent further includes a circuit configured to generate a grant signal to said first agent responsive to said

plurality of request signals and said state, said grant signal indicative of whether or not said first agent wins said arbitration. (col.6, lines 26-65)

As per claims 4, 12, 26, Yang discloses circuit is further responsive to an agent identifier used to identify a winning agent of said arbitration. (col.6, lines 26-65)

As per claims 5, 13, 23, Yang discloses wherein said arbiter of said first agent further comprises a circuit configured to update said state responsive to an agent identifier used to identify a winning agent of said arbitration, wherein said circuit is configured to update said state to indicate a lower priority for said winning agent after said winning agent wins said arbitration.(col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claims 6, 14, 25 Yang discloses wherein said circuit is further configured to update said state to indicate that other agents are higher in priority than said first agent responsive to said first agent winning said arbitration. (col.7, lines 31-44)

As per claims 7, 15, 27 Yang discloses wherein said bus is a split transaction bus, and wherein said arbiter for said first agent is configured to arbitrate for an address portion of said bus, and wherein an agent identifier is included as a portion of a transaction.(col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claims 8, 16, 28, 29-30, Yang discloses wherein said bus is split transaction bus, and wherein said arbiter for said first agent is configured to arbitrate for a data portion of said bus.(col.5,lines 15-37)

As per claim 18, Yang discloses the method further comprising updating said state after the arbitration. (col.7, lines 31-44)

As per claim 20, Yang discloses wherein said determining includes being responsive to agent identifiers included with the request signals. (col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claim 21, Yang discloses the method further comprising updating said state for said first agent to indicate that each of said plurality of agents requesting arbitration is higher priority than said first agent if said plurality of agents requesting arbitration is higher priority than said first agent if said first agent wins said arbitration. (col.6, lines 26-65)

As per claim 32, Yang discloses a carrier medium comprising a database which is operated upon by a program executable on a computer system, the program operating on the database to perform a portion of a process to fabricate an integrated circuit including circuitry described by the database, the circuitry described in the database including a first agent configured for coupling to a bus in which said first agent is one of plurality of agents that are capable of being coupled to said bus, said plurality of agents having corresponding arbiters coupled to receive request signals and operate as distributed arbiters among the plurality of agents, request signals corresponding to whether or not the arbiter of a respective agent is arbitrating for said bus, and (col.4, lines 26-63), (col.5, lines 15-37), (col.6, lines 19-65)

Yang discloses all the limitations as above except wherein an arbiter of said first agent to maintain order of its priority in relation to other agents arbitration for said bus and to determine if said first agent wins an arbitration for

said bus responsive to said request signals without determining which other agent wins arbitration, if said first agent does not win arbitration. However, Smith discloses distributed arbitration, each bus master sees all bus requests and determines whether or not it has priority to take control of the bus. A particular bus master having a default bus grant, it need not request access to the bus. The parked bus master initiate transactions without first arbitrating for bus access by issuing a bus request. (col.1, lines 48-67), (col.3, line 64-col.5, line 30)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Smith's teaching into Yang system so as to improve a better performance for the system. (col.2, lines 9-17)

As per claim 33, Yang discloses wherein said arbiter of said first agent comprises one or more registers configured to store a state indicative of : (i) which of said plurality of agents are higher priority than said first agent for said arbitrations; (col.5, lines 15-37) and (ii) which of said plurality of agents are lower priority than said first agent for said arbitration. (col.7, lines 31-44)

As per claim 34, Yang discloses wherein said arbiter of said first agent further includes a circuit configured to generate a grant signal to said first agent responsive to said plurality of request signals and said state, said grant signal indicative of whether or not said first agent wins said arbitration.(col.6, lines 26-65)

As per claim 35, Yang discloses wherein said circuit is further responsive to an agent identifier used to identify a winning agent of said arbitration. (col.6, lines 26-65)

As per claim 36, Yang discloses wherein said arbiter of said first agent further comprises a circuit configured to update said state responsive to said agent identifier, wherein said circuit is configured to update said state to indicate a lower priority after winning said arbitration. (col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claim 37, Yang discloses wherein said circuit is further configured to update said state to indicate that other agents are higher in priority than said first agent responsive to said first agent winning said arbitration.(col.7, lines 31-44)

As per claim 38, Yang discloses wherein said bus is a split transaction bus, and wherein said arbiter for said first agent is configured to arbitrate for an address portion of said bus, and wherein an agent identifier is included as a portion of a transaction. (col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claim 39, Yang discloses wherein said bus is a split transaction bus, and wherein said arbiter for said first agent is configured to arbitrate for a data portion of said bus. (col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claims 22, 40, Yang discloses a carrier medium comprising a database which is operated upon by a program executable on a computer system, the program operating on the database to perform a portion of a process to fabricate an integrated circuit including circuitry described by the database, the circuitry described in the database including a distributed arbiter comprising:

- One or more registers of the distributed arbiter of a first agent configured to store a state indicative of: (i) which of a plurality of agents coupled to a bus are higher priority than said first agent for an arbitration, and (ii) which of said plurality of agents are lower priority than said first agent for said arbitration; said first agent and plurality of agents having respective distributed arbiters to determine priority of arbitration requests for said bus and said arbiter for said first agent to compare arbitration request from other agents to said state stored in said one or more registers; and (col.5, lines 15-37), (col.7, lines 31-44)
- A first circuit coupled to receive an agent identifier indicative of a second agent winning arbitration of said bus if said first agent does not win arbitration, said agent identifier transmitted on said bus as part of a transaction from a distributed arbiter of said second agent, wherein said first circuit is configured to update said state responsive to said agent identifier. (col.5, lines 15-37), (col.6, lines 19-65)

Yang discloses all the limitations as above except to determine if said first agent wins said arbitration, but without determining which other agent wins arbitration, if said first agent does not win arbitration. However, Smith discloses distributed arbitration, each bus master sees all bus requests and determines whether or not it has priority to take control of the bus. A particular bus master having a default bus grant, it need not request access to the bus. The parked bus

Art Unit: 2112

master initiate transactions without first arbitrating for bus access by issuing a bus request. (col.1, lines 48-67), (col.3, line 64-col.5, line 30)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Smith's teaching into Yang system so as to improve a better performance for the system. (col.2, lines 9-17)

As per claim 41, Yang discloses wherein said first circuit in said first agent is configured to update said state to indicate that said second agent is lower priority than said first agent if said second agent wins arbitration. (col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claim 42, Yang discloses wherein said arbiter further comprises a second circuit coupled to said one or more registers and coupled to receive said arbitration requests wherein said second circuit is configured to determine if said first agent wins said arbitration responsive to said state and said arbitration requests. (col.6, lines 19-65)

As per claim 43, Yang discloses wherein said first circuit is configured to update said state to indicate that other agents are higher priority than said first agent responsive to said first agent winning said arbitration. (col.5, lines 15-37), (col.7, lines 31-44)

As per claim 44, Yang discloses wherein said second circuit is configured to determine if said first agent wins said arbitration using the agent identifiers to identify agents that generate arbitration requests. (col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claim 45, Yang discloses wherein said bus is a split transaction bus, and wherein said arbiter is configured to arbitrate to place an address on said bus.(col.5, lines 15-37)

As per claim 47, Yang discloses wherein said bus is a split transaction bus, and wherein said arbiter is configured to arbitrate to place data on said bus.(col.5, lines 15-37)

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's amendment filed on 6/1/04 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

a. In response to applicant' argument that Yang does not disclose wherein an arbiter of said first agent is to maintain order of its priority in relation to other agents arbitrating for said bus and to determine if said first agent wins an arbitration for said bus responsive to said request signals without determining which other agent wins arbitration, if said first agent does not win arbitration. However, Smith discloses distributed arbitration, each bus master sees all bus requests and determines whether or not it has priority to take control of the bus. A particular bus master having a default bus grant, it need not request access to the bus. The parked bus master initiate transactions without first arbitrating for bus access by issuing a bus request. (col.1, lines 48-67), (col.3, line 64-col.5, line 30)

Thus, the prior art teaches the invention as claimed and the amended do not distinguish over the prior art as applied.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Huynh whose telephone number is (703)305-5384 or via e-mail addressed to [kim.huynh3@uspto.gov]. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM- 6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (703) 305-4815 or via e-mail addressed to [mark.rinehart@uspto.gov]. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-5631.

Kim Huynh

August 7, 2004


MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2112